

**REMARKS**

The Office Action mailed October 3, 2006 has been reviewed and the comments therein were carefully considered. Claims 1-19 are currently pending. Claims 1-19 stand rejected.

**Claim Objections**

*Claims 5, 6, 7, 13, 14 and 15 are objected to because of the following informalities: In the specification a "typed model element field handler subclass" is defined as an abstract class that implements all methods defined as abstract. However, by its definition, an abstract class does not implement any methods. Only its subclasses, which are not abstract, implement the methods from the parent class. An abstract class may declare other abstract classes, but not implement them. Herein, the term "typed model element field handler subclass" will be used as an abstract class, which declares subclasses that implement methods declared in the parent class.*

Applicant respectfully submits that term “typed model element field handler subclass” should be interpreted as stated in the specification. In particular, Applicant’s specification in paragraph 31 states:

A first subclass of the singleton model field handler object 402, is a typed model element field handler object 406. The typed model filed handler object 406 is an abstract class that implements all methods defined as abstract in the singleton model field handler 402.

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 5, 6, 7, 13, 14 and 15 are in condition for allowance.

*Claim 10 is objected to because it lacks antecedent basis from the specification because the specification does not disclose using a root of a tree structure.*

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner.

As an initial matter, the claims as filed are considered part of the specification, and since claim 10 as originally filed disclosed the element “root of the tree structure,” that element is considered disclosed in the specification. See MPEP § 608.01(l) (“In establishing a disclosure,

applicant may rely not only on the specification and drawing as filed but also on the original claims if their content justifies it. Where subject matter not shown in the drawing or described in the description is claimed in the application as filed, and such original claim itself constitutes a clear disclosure of this subject matter, then the claim should be treated on its merits, and requirement made to amend the drawing and description to show this subject matter. The claim should not be attacked either by objection or rejection because this subject matter is lacking in the drawing and description. It is the drawing and description that are defective, not the claim.”)

Additionally, it is well known in the art, and by definition, that each tree structure has a “root.” Applicant, therefore, respectfully submits that claim 10 is in condition for allowance.

*Claims 14 and 15 are objected to because they are currently written as dependent on claim 12. However, they should be dependent on claim 13.*

Applicant has amended claims 14 and 15 in response to the Office Action objection. Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments overcome the objections and are, therefore, in condition for allowance.

### **Claim Rejections Under 35 USC § 101**

*Claims 1 and 9 are rejected under 35 USC §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.*

*Claim 16 is rejected under 35 USC §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.*

Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 9, 16, and 18 in response to the Office Action rejection. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are drawn to statutory subject matter and include data that is presented by a computing device to users. Applicant, therefore, respectfully submits that claims 1, 9, 16, and 18 are in condition for allowance.

### **Claim Rejections Under 35 USC § 112**

*Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.*

The Office Action stated that the claimed “tree structure” is not supported by the specification because:

the tree structure as described in the specification does not seem to be a tree structure. Rather, it describes various associations, relations between elements or a **hierarchical structure**.

Office Action, page 3. (Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that the definition of a tree structure is based upon the notion of the hierarchical relationship between its elements. Applicant respectfully submits that support in the specification for the claimed tree structure may be found in the figures and in the claims as originally filed. Therefore, Applicant submits that claims 9 and 10 are in condition for allowance.

### **Claim Rejections Under 35 USC § 102**

*Claims 1, 4, 8-10 and 12 are rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Brumme et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,134,559 ("Brumme").*

Of the rejected claims, claims 1 and 9 are independent claims. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Independent claims 1 and 9 include the claimed feature of “storage of the attribute value is separate from handling of the attribute value.”

Applicant respectfully submits that Brumme does not disclose “storage of the attribute value [being] separate from handling of the attribute value.” Applicant discloses in the specification that “the physical storage of attribute values 410 has been separated from the handling of the attribute values 420” with reference to Fig. 4 of the drawings. Application, page

9, Fig. 4. Brumme does not disclose the separation of the storage of the attribute value and the handling of the attribute value. Therefore, for at least this reason, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1 and 9 are in condition for allowance. Dependent claims 2-8, and 11-15 which ultimately depend from claims 1 and 9, respectively, are allowable for at least the same reason as independent claims 1 and 9.

### **Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §103**

*Claim 2 is rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Brumme in view of Mathews et al, U.S. Publication No. 2003/0163479 ("Mathews").*

Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claim 2 is allowable for at least the same reason as the independent claim from which it ultimately depends.

*Claims 3, 5, 6, 7, 11, 13, 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Brumme in view of Coad, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,851,105 ("Coad").*

Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 3, 5, 6, 7, 11, 13, 14 and 15 are allowable for at least the same reason as the independent claims from which they ultimately depend.

*Claims 16-19 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brumme in view of Brogden, et al., Java 2 Programmer Exam Cram 2 ("Brogden").*

Of the rejected claims, claims 16 and 18 are independent claims. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Independent claims 16 and 18 include the claimed feature of “storage of the attribute value is separate from handling of the attribute value.”

Applicant respectfully submits that Brumme in view of Brogden does not disclose “storage of the attribute value [being] separate from handling of the attribute value.” Applicant discloses in the specification that “the physical storage of attribute values 410 has been separated from the handling of the attribute values 420” with reference to Fig. 4 of the drawings. Application, page 9, Fig. 4. Brumme does not disclose the separation of the storage of the

attribute value and the handling of the attribute value. Therefore, for at least this reason, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 16 and 18 are in condition for allowance. Dependent claims 17 and 19 which ultimately depend from claims 16 and 18, respectively, are allowable for at least the same reason as independent claims 16 and 18.

Applicants therefore respectfully request reconsideration of the pending claims and a finding of their allowability. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. Please feel free to contact the undersigned should any questions arise with respect to this case that may be addressed by telephone

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 2, 2007

By: William J. Allen  
William J. Allen  
Registration No. 51,393  
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.  
10 South Wacker Drive  
Suite 3000  
Chicago, IL 60606  
Telephone: 312-463-5000  
Facsimile: 312-463-5001